

1
2
3
4
5
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6

7 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8

9 JAN ALEC WEITH,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 GOVERNOR GAVIN NEWSOM,

13 et al.

14 Defendants.

15 Case No. 1:22-cv-01256-JLT-SKO

16 **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION TO
DISMISS WITH PREJUDICE FOR PLAINTIFF'S
FAILURE TO OBEY COURT ORDERS AND
LOCAL RULES AND FAILURE TO PROSECUTE**

17 **(Doc. 4)**

18 **TWENTY-ONE (21) DAY DEADLINE**

19 Plaintiff Jan Alec Weith, proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil action on September 30, 2022.
20 (Doc. 1.) Plaintiff also filed an application to proceed without the prepayment of fees, but the form
21 application was not complete, as it contained several deficiencies and unintelligible handwriting.
(Doc. 2.)

22 On October 6, 2022, the Court issued an order denying without prejudice Plaintiff's
23 application to proceed without the prepayment of fees and directing Plaintiff to either file an
24 amended application, completed and signed, or pay the \$402 filing fee for this action within twenty-
25 one days. (Doc. 3.) Plaintiff was cautioned that the failure to comply with the Court's order would
26 result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. (*Id.*) When served at Plaintiff's address
27 of record, the October 6, 2022, order was returned as undeliverable on October 17, 2022. (*See*
Docket.) More than twenty-one days passed, and Plaintiff failed to file an amended application or
28 to pay the filing fee. (*Id.*)

1 On December 29, 2022, an order issued for Plaintiff to show cause (“OSC”) within twenty-
2 one days why the action should not be dismissed for his failure to comply with the Court’s October
3 6, 2022, order and the local rules and for his failure to prosecute. (Doc. 4.) Local Rule 183(b)
4 provides that:

5 A party appearing in propria persona shall keep the Court and opposing parties
6 advised as to his or her current address. If mail directed to a plaintiff in propria
7 persona by the Clerk is returned by the U.S. Postal Service, and if such plaintiff
fails to notify the Court and opposing parties within sixty-three (63) days thereafter
8 of a current address, the Court may dismiss the action without prejudice for failure
to prosecute.

9 E.D. Cal. L.R. 183(b). More than sixty-three days have passed since the Court’s October 6, 2022,
10 order was returned as undeliverable. Plaintiff has neither responded to that order or the OSC, nor
11 has he contacted the Court to request an extension, or to otherwise explain his lack of compliance
12 with both orders.

13 The Local Rules, corresponding with Fed. R. Civ. P. 11, provide that “[f]ailure of counsel
14 or of a party to comply with . . . any order of the Court may be grounds for the imposition by the
15 Court of any and all sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” E.D. Cal. L.R. 110; *see*
16 *also* E.D. Cal. L.R. 183(a). “District courts have inherent power to control their dockets,” and in
17 exercising that power, a court may impose sanctions, including dismissal of an action. *Thompson*
18 *v. Hous. Authority of L.A.*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with
19 prejudice, based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action or failure to obey a court order, or failure
20 to comply with local rules. *See, e.g., Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 1992)
21 (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Malone v. U.S.*
22 *Postal Serv.*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order);
23 *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to prosecute and
24 to comply with local rules).

25 Based on Plaintiff’s failure to comply with, or otherwise respond to, the Court’s October 6,
26 2022 order, the OSC, and his failure to keep his address updated, there is no alternative but to
27 recommend that the action be dismissed for failure to obey court orders, local court rules, and
28 failure to prosecute this action.

1 Accordingly, it is **HEREBY RECOMMENDED** that this action be dismissed, with
2 prejudice, for Plaintiff's failure to obey the Court's orders and local rules and the failure to
3 prosecute this action.

4 These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District Judge
5 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). **Within twenty-**
6 **one (21) days** after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, Plaintiff may file
7 written objections with the Court. The document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate
8 Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within
9 the specified time may result in the waiver of rights on appeal. *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d
10 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing *Baxter v. Sullivan*, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).

11
12 IT IS SO ORDERED.
13

Dated: January 24, 2023

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28